REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Claims 1-36 are currently pending. By way of this reply, claims 1-12, 14-23, 25 and 27-35 have been amended, and claim 13 has been canceled.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e) in View of Sommerer

In the 3rd paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 8-10 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0001104 to Sommerer et al. ("Sommerer"). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." See *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a method that includes determining whether a received search query has been previously received and, if so, determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query. If the portion of the previously stored result set is determined to be valid, the method outputs it as a search result of the search query. Therefore, the method can output a result set for a search query without actually conducting a new search. Amended independent claims 17 and 34 include limitations similar to claim 1.

Sommerer, among other differences, fails to disclose the claimed limitation of "determining whether the search query has been previously received" and "determining

whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query." Sommerer, in contrast, discloses a method and system for users to search through records of previously viewed resource pages across multiple browser sessions. See Sommerer, paragraph [0027]. Therefore, after Sommerer's system receives a search query, it conducts a search in previously visited pages, rather than retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34.

Sommerer does not disclose the claimed element of "determining whether the search query has been previously received." Examiner cited paragraph [0038] of Sommerer for this element. However, the cited paragraph only discloses that "a user may search previously visited web pages based on previous search queries." For example, "the user can at a later time perform a browser sessions search based on 'Python' to display those web pages navigated from the results of the 'Monty Python' web search." See Sommerer, paragraph [0038]. Therefore, the cited paragraph teaches conducting searches in web pages previously visited in a search result. Sommerer does not hint or suggest of determining whether a received search query was previously received.

Sommerer also does not disclose the claimed element of "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query." Examiner cited paragraph [0038] of Sommerer for this element. However, as stated above, the cited paragraph only teaches conducting searches in web pages previously visited in a search result, which is different from determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with a

search query is a valid search result set for the search query. Therefore, Sommerer fails to disclose the above cited feature as required by amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34.

In view of the above, Sommerer fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Sommerer and Baidya

In the 6th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 4-7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Sommerer and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0046311 to Baidya et al. ("Baidya"). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Sommerer fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Baidya similarly fails. Baidya discloses a system that crawls the Internet for web sites, extracts URLs from web sites, categorizes the web sites and URLs, and conducts user search queries that search a subset of the web sites and URLs based on the category information. See Baidya, Abstract Summary, paragraphs [0013], [0019] and [0020]. Baidya is all-together silent as to determining whether a received search query has been previously received and, if so, determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Baidya fails to at least disclose

these limitations of amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34 not disclosed or taught in Sommerer.

In view of the above, Sommerer and Baidya, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34 are patentable over Sommerer and Baidya. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Sommerer, Baidya and Denny

In the 7th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 11, 13-15, 17-27, 29-31 and 34-36 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,082,428 to Denny et al. ("Denny"). Claim 13 has been canceled. For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Sommerer and Baidya fail to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Denny similarly fails. Denny discloses a system and method for collaborative searching. Denny's system receives search queries in a query server, which stores previously executed queries and corresponding results in a database. Subsequent search queries are compared to the stored queries in the query server. If a stored query is substantially similar to a subsequent query, Denny's system returns to the user the result corresponding to the stored query as the search result of the subsequent query. See Denny, col. 2, lines 3-11. Denny is all-together silent as to determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search

result set for the search query, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Denny fails to disclose at least one limitation of amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34 not disclosed or taught in Sommerer and Baidya.

In view of the above, Sommerer, Baidya and Denny, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34 are patentable over Sommerer, Baidya and Denny. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Sommerer, Baidya, Denny and Shaath

In the 8th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 12, 16, 28 and 32 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 20060010150 to Shaath et al. ("Shaath"). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Sommerer, Baidya and Denny fail to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Shaath similarly fails. Shaath discloses a method and system for managing a file, including determining an expiration date and a minimum lifespan for the file, and deleting the file when expired. See Shaath, paragraphs [0102-0104], and Fig. 6. Shaath is all-together silent as to determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly,

Shaath fails to at least disclose those limitations of amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34 not disclosed or taught in Sommerer, Baidya and Denny.

In view of the above, Sommerer, Baidya, Denny and Shaath, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 17 and 34 are patentable over Sommerer, Baidya, Denny and Shaath. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Sommerer, Baidya and Rivers

In the 9th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claim 33 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0267813 to Rivers-Moore et al. ("Rivers"). Claim 33 has been amended to depend on claim 1. For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Sommerer and Baidya fail to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claim 1. Rivers similarly fails. Rivers discloses a solution for a data file that enables a user to interact with data in the data file. See Rivers, Summary. The solutions are downloaded and stored locally. When a solution is needed, a unique special name for the solution identifier is computed to determine whether the solution is stored locally. If the solution is stored locally and up-to-date, Rivers's system uses the local solution, otherwise it downloads the solution from online. See Rivers, paragraphs [0079-0105], and Fig. 7. Rivers is all-together silent as to determining whether a received search

query has been previously received and, if so, determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Rivers fails to at least disclose those limitations of amended independent claim 1 not disclosed or taught in Sommerer and Baidya.

In view of the above, Sommerer, Baidya and Rivers, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claim 1. Thus, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Sommerer and Baidya. Dependent claim 33 is allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 and 14-36, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and requests allowance of them.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

<div align="right">

Respectfully Submitted,
Mihai Florin Ionescu

</div>

Date: January 29, 2007   By: /Brian Hoffman/

Brian M. Hoffman, Reg. No. 39,713
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (415) 281-1350